



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/481,758	01/11/2000	Ahmed Tewfik	1064.002US1	6069
21186	7590 04/23/2004		EXAMINER	
		ESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.	LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
P.O. BOX 293 MINNEAPOL	38 JIS, MN 55402	-	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		* &*	2178	α
•		•	DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004	,
		·*		•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

D

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/481,758	TEWFIK ET AL.	2
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Matthew J. Ludwig	2178	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron b. cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communicat ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ition.
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 F</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowal closed in accordance with the practice under E	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr		is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burear * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicative documents have been received in CPCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal (6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 09/481,758 Page 2

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A filed 2/6/04.

- 2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claim 1 is an independent claim.
- 3. The rejections of claims 1-20, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being over Cox has been withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-3, 10, 14, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeung et al., USPN 6,668,246 filed (3/24/99) in view of Rhoads et al., USPN 6,636,615 filed (11/3/99).

In reference to independent claim 1, 14, Yeung teaches:

- A platform comprises an electronic device including a processor and a communication device to transmit and/or receive content. Content is generally defined as data in the form of video, images, audio, text, programs or any combination thereof. See column 2, lines 49-59. The reference provides a reasonable suggestion of multimedia content being received and sent.
- Content protection mechanisms (e.g. watermark insertion, visual/perceptual scrambling) being performed on content delivered to a client platform. A first content protection mechanism performs robust watermark insertion by embedding data into content. See column 4, lines 43-47 and column 5, lines 1-10. The reference suggests the watermarking of a portion of

Application/Control Number: 09/481,758

Art Unit: 2178

the original multimedia content source to provide content protection; however, the reference does not explicitly teach watermarking a content source twice, each time with a different watermark. Rhoads provides an image that has two digital watermarks inserted therein. The two distinct watermarks demonstrate multimedia content version with two watermarks. The final transformation of the document disclosed in Rhoads provides a reasonable suggestion of a final watermarked content source utilizing different watermarked versions of the original document. Because the claim limitations are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art, the multiple watermarking methods of Rhoads combined with the watermarking methods of Yeung provide a reasonable interpretation of the claimed subject matter when read as a whole. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yeung and Rhoads before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the watermark methods taught by Yeung to include the multiple watermark methods of Rhoads, because the methods would have given an author the added benefit of tracking multiple transformations of an original copy for enhanced copyright protection.

Page 3

In reference to dependent claim 2, Yeung teaches:

A first content protection mechanism performs robust watermark insertion by embedding data into content. Data may be embedded into content in an unobtrusive way so that the quality of content is not reduced and subsequently extracted for analysis. See column 5, lines 1-10.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Yeung teaches:

To support watermarking in a spatial domain, access control logic may signal a decompression unit to decompress content before data is embedded. See column 5, lines 10-20. In reference to dependent claim 10, Yeung teaches:

Application/Control Number: 09/481,758 Page 4

Art Unit: 2178

Prior to degrading to quality of content to produce deliverable content, a fourth content protection mechanism performs a fast watermark insertion scheme by embedding data that identifies the targeted recipient of deliverable content. See column 6, lines 52-60. In reference to dependent claim 17-20, the claims reflect similar methods used for performing the steps of utilizing two watermarks as claimed in claims 1-3, and in further view of the following, are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 4-9, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Brogliatti et al., USPN 6,564,225 filed (7/14/2000)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/481,758

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML April 13, 2004

> STEPHEN S. HONG PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5